

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed November 4, 2002 required an election under 35 U.S.C. 121 from among:

Species I, claims 1 to 5, 23, and 27 to 30, drawn to a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device of the first embodiment, including depositing polysilicon followed by selectively grinding or polishing the peripheral portion and the beveled portion on the main surface side of the target substrate for forming a trench capacitor; and

Species II, claims 1, 6, 24 to 26, and 31 to 32, drawn to a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device of the second embodiment, including depositing a metal film of copper followed by selectively grinding or polishing the peripheral portion and the beveled portion on the main surface side of the target substrate.

Applicants provisionally elect, without traverse, for further prosecution of this application, the invention identified in the Office Action as Species I, claims 1 to 4 and 27 to 30. Applicants submit that since claims 5 and 23 are directed to a film of a material providing a source of contamination, thus should be included in Species II.

Species I and Species II are related to each other in that claims for both Species I and Species II are drawn to a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device. If the restriction requirement is nonetheless maintained, Applicants reserve the right of rejoinder of the subject matter of the non-elected claims or the right to pursue canceled subject matter in a continuation and/or divisional application.

It is respectfully submitted that examination of all of the claims pending in this application is in the spirit of the right of rejoinder such that the restriction requirement should be reconsidered, and reformulated or withdrawn entirely.

It would seem, that to require the filing of a separate divisional application directed to the Species II claims will result in the very same search being repeated, but at a later date. It is submitted that the duplicate search would be quite inefficient to the operation of the Patent and Trademark Office. Furthermore, it is likely that the same Examiner would be in charge of the divisional case; but since the divisional application will be examined at a much later date, the Examiner will have to conduct a duplicate, redundant search at the time he examines the divisional application. Alternatively, if a different Examiner were assigned to the divisional application, a significant loss of PTO efficiency would be incurred as a result of the examination of the divisional application.

Thus, the only logical outcome of the present restriction requirement would be to delay the examination of the Species II claims, resulting in inefficiencies and unnecessary expenditures by Applicants and the PTO, and since a single search can be performed for both species of claims without any significant burden on the Office, it is respectfully requested that this restriction requirement be withdrawn.

In this regard the Examiner is respectfully invited to consider the extreme prejudice to Applicants by the present restriction requirement, including: the necessity of having to pay an additional filing fee to the PTO and others for prosecuting an additional application; the loss of patent term for the Species II claims if Applicants must now file a separate application at this time directed thereto due to prosecution of such application beginning far later than

prosecution to date in the present application; and to the post GATT 20 year patent term calculating from the earliest U.S. filing date.

Additionally, the Examiner is respectfully invited to review the text of MPEP §803, which in part states (with emphasis) that:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be **made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits**, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The results of the present restriction requirement are inefficiencies and unnecessary expenditures by both the Applicants and the PTO, and extreme prejudice to Applicants. Therefore, the restriction has not been shown to be proper, especially since the requisite showing of serious burden has not been made in the Office Action and that Species II and I claims are both related to a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device.

Hence, it is evident that there is unity of invention and allowable subject matter in the pending claims, and in view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the requirement for restriction and favorable reconsideration of all of the claims on the merits are respectfully requested.

Moreover, if the restriction requirement is nonetheless maintained, Applicants reserve the right of rejoinder or the right to pursue canceled subject matter in a continuation and/or a divisional application as mandated by the MPEP.

Any additional fee occasioned by this paper, or any overpayment in those fees, may be charged or credited to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Early and favorable examination of all of the claims on the merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the requirement for restriction and favorable reconsideration of Species I and Species II claims on the merits are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By:



Grace L. Pan

Registration No. 39,440

Tel. (212) 588-0800

Fax (212) 588-0500